



Federated AAI and EU Law

Andrew Cormack
Chief Regulatory Adviser, Janet
[@Janet_LegReg](https://twitter.com/Janet_LegReg)



- Federated AAI recognised as a Privacy Enhancing Tool
 - According to UK and Ontario Privacy Commissioners
 - Less information processed, more reliably
 - So privacy law ought to encourage its adoption
- Current EU law designed for world of 1995
 - Can't design FedAAI to fit the law ☹️
 - We tried that with cookie law ☹️
 - Legal uncertainty may actually discourage adoption ☹️



- Doesn't handle three-party relationships (user/IdP/SP)
 - And we're already thinking of four or more (social Id, Virtual Orgs)
- Status of indirectly-linked identifiers is unclear
 - German courts even disagree with each other!
 - Some choices lead to impossible-to-fulfil duties!
- Correct basis for processing is unclear
 - Consent? Necessary for contract? Legitimate interests?
- Rules for exports from EEA are unclear
 - Member State formalities and approaches incompatibly different



- Technically
 - Easy to use,
 - Privacy-respecting,
 - Secure
- Legally
 - With a clear basis,
 - That encourages privacy-protecting options
- How to get there?
 - National federations/international agreements (REFEDs, eduGAIN)
 - New draft *Data Protection Regulation* (2012-present)



On the legal side...

janet



US public domain by NARA/Wikimedia Commons

- Draft *Data Protection Regulation* now deep in politics
 - Basic disagreement on what individual citizens want
 - Commission draft Jan 2012
 - Parliament response Oct 2013
 - After considering >3000 amendments to COM draft
 - Council haven't published **initial** negotiating position
 - Seem to be aiming at 2015
 - Privacy experts want to start again!
- And then PRISM/Snowden
 - “No Personal Data release to countries that spy”
 - Errr... Plenty of those **inside** the EU!
- Federation needs unlikely to be heard in the noise ☹️



- Doesn't handle three-party relationships (user/IdP/SP)
 - And we're already thinking of four or more (social Id, Virtual Orgs)
- Status of indirectly-linked identifiers is unclear
 - German courts even disagree with each other!
 - Some choices lead to impossible-to-fulfil duties!
- Correct basis for processing is unclear
 - Consent? Necessary for contract? Legitimate interests?
- Rules for exports from EEA are unclear
 - Member State formalities and approach incompatibly different



- Still doesn't handle three-party relationships (user/IdP/SP)
- Recognises that indirectly-linked identifiers are different
 - And that impossible duties shouldn't be created
 - But much argument on what rules should apply
- Correct basis for processing still unclear
 - Consent? Necessary for contract? Legitimate interests?
- Rules for exports from EEA being argued
 - But differences between countries should be reduced
- Still can't design FedAAI to fit the law ☹



- Things may not be so different
 - Many countries implementing EU-inspired laws
 - US FERPA/HIPPA may actually be more restrictive than EU
 - And spying doesn't just happen "over there"
- But EU law struggles to recognise that
 - Formal recognition of equivalent countries is slow
 - EU-US Safe Harbor can't cover public sector
 - Doesn't actually regulate spies (despite what you may have heard)



Where now?



- Minimise data/processing
 - Whatever privacy law emerges, less ought to be better
- Minimise surprise
 - Happy users won't complain to lawyers
- Reduce (regulatory) risk, don't hope to eliminate it
 - Aim: benefit outweighs risk
 - Law often requires “appropriate”/“equivalent”/etc. anyway



-
- Choose the right attribute
 - Service Providers
 - Do you need name/e-mail, or will a unique ID do?
 - Do you need it from the IdP or will self-asserted do?
 - Home-for-homeless/socialID only offer self-asserted anyway
 - Identity Providers
 - Provide privacy-protecting values, so SPs can rely on them
 - Deal effectively with reported problems, so SPs don't have to
 - Populate real-world identities as some services do need them



-
- Most users want authorisation to happen!
 - Service providers
 - Only use attributes to provide requested services
 - Tell users/IdPs/federations what you do and don't do
 - Unexpected processing makes both law and users unhappy
 - Identity providers
 - Document your default release policy
 - Consider notification/consent tools so users can find out



-
- Federated education services benefit user and organisation
 - And protect privacy better than the alternative
 - Service Providers
 - Try to fit the appropriate REFEDs (draft) service category
 - Collaboration: users need to recognise each other, R&E focussed
 - Library: need to assign users to licenses and save their choices
 - Association: just need to know it's a student/member/etc
 - ... (let us know if you aren't one of these)
 - Identity Providers
 - Set reasonable default release policies: nice when things “just work”
 - Consider releasing more (needed) attributes for more R&E benefit
 - Accept reasonable level of compliance



- National solutions may look easier
 - Shared assumptions/culture/law
 - And some things don't cross borders (e.g. course codes?)
 - Or won't be of interest to outsiders (e.g. internal structures)
- But international is increasingly important
 - For research/education/work
 - Harmonisation/standardisation easier than translation
 - Find/develop/propose common approaches to common problems
 - “close enough”, rather than “not invented here”
 - Should save effort now: will save pain in future



We're progressing...

janet



CC BY-NC-ND 2007 by Gerald Davison/Flickr

A decorative background of overlapping, semi-transparent circles in various colors including orange, red, yellow, green, and blue, creating a vibrant, abstract pattern.

Questions?

Janet, Lumen House
Library Avenue, Harwell Oxford
Didcot, Oxfordshire

t: +44 (0) 1235 822200

f: +44 (0) 1235 822399

e: Andrew.Cormack@ja.net

b: <https://community.ja.net/blogs/regulatory-developments>